BVCP Process Subcommittee Meeting #8
February 17, 2016 Noon-1:00
Fishbowl Conference Room – Municipal Building

Subcommittee Purpose

The Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP) Process Subcommittee's Role will be to monitor and provide input on the public process throughout the BVCP Update process. The BVCP Committee consists of 2 council members (Weaver, Brockett), 2 planning board members (Gerstle, May), a Boulder County Commissioner (Jones), and a County planning commission member (Gargano).

Attendees: Sam Weaver, Aaron Brockett, John Gerstle, Lieschen Gargano, Leonard May, Elise Jones
Staff: Lesli Ellis, Jean Gatza, Courtland Hyser, Caitlin Zacharias, Sung Han, Michael Davidson, Steven Giang, Pete Fogg, Nicole Wobus
Public: (5 members)

*Comments by subcommittee are the bullet points that begin with bold text.
**Staff responses are in italics.

Proposed Agenda

1. **Report back on actions recommended at last meeting. (10 minutes)**
   - Website changes
     - *The goal of these changes is to make website as easy-to-use as possible and improve accessibility and clarity.*
     - **One of the weakest points is the searchability of the City's website.**
       The website unfortunately cannot incorporate Google-type searches.
     - **The header bar on the updated website is helpful. Is there a test site that the subcommittee could try and offer feedback?**
       Staff could look into this or send out a link when the updated website is initially released to allow an opportunity for early edits.
     - **Once something moves out of the "News" section, will it still be available on the project webpage?**
       Yes. Content will be moved to the appropriate section of the website once it is no longer "News."
     - **It would be helpful to have additional contact info on the CU South page not just for city staff, but for CU staff as well.**

2. **Demo ESRI 3D Modeling and use in engagement (15 minutes)**
   - Demo storyboard mapping, virtual map
     - *"Story maps" are available on the project webpage under "Foundations Work." They display interactive maps on the subcommunity- and city-wide scale of existing land use, parks and open space, nature, and transportation, among others. The user can zoom in, pan, and rotate, turn layers on and off, view legends, change the base map to satellite imagery or other types of base maps, and work with shadows on buildings, among other functionalities.*
     - **The "future land use designations" should be called "current land use designations." Can the zoning map also be added on?**
       Yes. Adding the zoning map would be helpful to tell the story of the relationship between zoning and land use.
     - **Is there data beyond the city that could be added to this?**
       Staff is currently exploring this option for Area III, and further coordination with the county is needed. Staff has a collection of data for Area III that was used to create the fact sheet, but

hosting of the county's data for the interactive online map is an obstacle that requires additional coordination.
- o **Will the story maps incorporate "heat-mapping"?**
  The draft heat maps that display information regarding projections are available on the project webpage currently. They are, however, not currently integrated into the story maps. Staff is working in coordination with ESRI to pursue options for improving this visualization, which could involve something other than heat maps.
- o **There is a navigation issue on the webpage to be able to find the story maps. Perhaps there should be a tab that simply reads "Maps."**
  (Please also note that Chrome is the best web browser to view these maps.)
- Demo ESRI City Engine
  - o *Story maps characterize existing conditions and information represented in the Trends Report and Community Profile. The City Engine work in progress is intended to show capacity modeling as guided by the rules of the city zoning code, e.g. FAR, setback standards, height, and parking, among others.*
  - o **How do you handle something that has multiple governing rules, e.g. FAR and required open space?**
  - o *Assumptions are needed in some instances. For example, parking requirements are directly related to square footage, and the CityEngine software is not able to iterate in the same way that a human designer would to find the balance point between the two. Development review staff helped to identify a reality-based set aside for parking (x% of the parcel) to account for parking needs, and then the software calculates how many spaces could fit in the allotted area, as well as the number of spaces that would be required based on the square footage of the building. In some zone districts, staff assumes no surface parking, in other (e.g. more suburban districts) more space for surface parking is set aside.*
  - o **Could the projections be refined by zoning district, e.g. incorporating variations in square footage per employee in "Industrial General" versus other areas?**
    Yes, this could be built into the model.
  - o **This will be extremely beneficial to the public to illustrate different scenarios based on land use changes.** This could also help visualize height scenarios, development potential, options for intensity, exemptions, and others.
  - o **However, there are also concerns about the applications of this tool.** It is very useful for considerations regarding jobs and population, however modeling buildings in future scenarios could be misleading. There are many ways to ask for exceptions to the rules, which would be challenging for any model to capture.
  - o **However, these aren't intended to be predictions, but rather representations of what intensities could yield.** The most fitting application is likely more on a corridor-scale as opposed to a city-wide scale.
    One consideration is to see what could work best for community engagement versus technical analysis. There are additional applications as well, e.g. development review.
  - o **Staff could engage the tech community in Boulder.** The tech community is interested in an RSS feed of upcoming meetings and agenda items.

3. **Draft Engagement Planning for Phase 3 (20 minutes)**
   Immediate Next Steps *(see attached Plan Phase 3 tasks; Draft engagement outline for Phase 3)*
   More of the analysis and next steps on shaping the focus topics will form this. The next meeting of the subcommittee will involve more engagement topics for discussion.
   - Video piece (Inside Boulder News) for clarification of focus topics and description of next steps
   - April Event Planning – input to inform options: "planning fair"; online exercises
   - Discuss possible facilitated process for Twin Lakes Sites (similar to the process used for Washington School)
     - o *There is a need for clarity moving forward regarding the change request process.*

- o **Several city council members have reached out to county to discuss the possibility of a facilitated process. The county is open to having a facilitated conversation**. There are a few questions regarding this potential facilitation process: is it appropriate to set up a facilitation process before the Feb. 29 meeting? Is the model that was used for the Washington School appropriate, which was about design? Providing direction to staff about the facilitation process after the Feb. 29 hearing, if the requests move forward, may also be beneficial.
  - o **Does the discussion about facilitation only pertain to Twin Lakes?** The facilitation process could be relevant for other requests, e.g. Hogan Pancost, since Planning Board made a request for Hogan Pancost to be reconsidered.
    As a reference, staff will include a description of the standard process used for further analysis of the requests in the memo to Council for their Feb. 29 meeting.
- Prepare / share timeline for other change requests

  Other questions:

  - o **When will second survey begin, or is a second survey necessary?**
    The spring and summer timeline when scenarios and information on trade-offs will be available could be a suitable time to consider a second survey.
  - o **When will land use changes requested by staff be available?**
    Upcoming agenda items with the city bodies could be an appropriate time to begin discussing land use and policy changes.
  - o **Can land use changes be requested by any of the four bodies?**
    Yes.

4. **Public Comment (10 minutes)**
   - Steve Pomerance- The process continually seems to be "weird." Isn't scenario development first? How do you know what land use changes to make if you haven't gone through scenarios? The exactitude isn't so critical as transportation, housing, and money. Real world development potential is critical. The growth projections seem to be made up. What does the build-out scenario look like? Projections never play out as predicted. The amount of affordable housing is disappearing fast. Land use is great, but is there a transportation and housing plan that people are willing to pay for? There is a need for real comprehensive, integrated planning and certainty in land use regulations because there is too much flexibility. This also applies to comp plan policies. It's easy to pick a policy to support whatever you want to do.
   - Dick Harris– One of biggest problems is finding things on the website. The search feature doesn't work well. Could there be a list of website for current things on the city website? Not all citizens want to use Chrome. *Response from staff: there are limitations to this, as some platforms only run well using certain browsers.*
   - Donna George- The story maps are great. One concern over targeted outreach is that it seems to be centered on groups that are in typically more in favor of density. With respect to Twin Lakes, there is a need for a subcommunity plan that includes incorporated and unincorporated parts of Gunbarrel. Gunbarrel is half-city and half-county, which is why City and County need to come together. The Gunbarrel Community Center plan didn't get built as intended. **Response from subcommittee: any one of those Area II parts of Gunbarrel can be annexed into the city. Navigating the unincorporated portions of Gunbarrel is a confusing issue for the city governing bodies, as they are not elected to represent those areas.**

- Mike Smith- City decisions affect unincorporated areas in Gunbarrel. There are comp plan policy commitments dropping to the floor. Both city and county need to talk the comp plan more seriously than appears to be the case here.

Next meeting: March 16